DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 455 EA 013 796

AUTHOR Bennett, Christine
TITLE A Study of the Causes of Disproportionality in Suspensions and Expulsions of Male and Black Students. Part Two: Characteristics of High and Low Disproportionality Schools.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 15 Apr 81
GRANT OEG-79-5210
NOTE 65p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981). For a related document, see EA 013 795.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Educational Environment; *Expulsion; High Schools; *Institutional Characteristics; Power Structure; Racial Attitudes; *Racial Discrimination; Racial Relations; *Sex Discrimination; Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Suspension; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

A three-part study of why disproportionate numbers of black and male high school students are expelled or suspended examines student and school characteristics and teacher attitudes. This part of the report looks at school characteristics. In eleven high schools in two large, urban, midwestern school districts, researchers used interviews, student records, questionnaire surveys, and state education department statistics to gather data for each school on means of student transportation, family backgrounds, and college plans as well as on their perceptions or attitudes concerning control over self-destiny, dislike of school, fairness of punishments, administrators' power, students' and parents' power, school climate, interracial relations and friendships, administrator support for desegregation, and white predominance in school activities. Analysis showed that, at schools with large disproportions of black suspensions or expulsions, students were less satisfied with school climate, had less interracial interaction and fewer interracial friendships, and perceived more white predominance in school. Schools in which students perceived administrators as supporting desegregation had lower levels of disproportionality, prompting the authors to emphasize that strong institutional support is a key factor in effective school integration. (Author/RW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED208455

# A Study of the Causes of Disproportionality in Suspensions and Expulsions of Male and Black Students*

## Part Two: Characteristics of High and Low Disproportionality Schools

Christine Bennett
Indiana University at Bloomington

Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the American Educational
Research Association in
Los Angeles on
April 15, 1981

Based on research conducted for The Project for the Equitable Administration of Student Discipline, Co-Directed by Christine Bennett and J. John Harris, III, October 1971 - January 1981.

*USOEG #79-5210

EA 013 796

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Bennett
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The fact that disproportionate numbers of males and Blacks are being suspended and expelled from our schools has been well established (eg. Bickel, 1980; Moody, 1980). However, the reasons have not.

Are the causes of discipline problems rooted in the socio-emotional characteristics of disruptive students (eg. unstable home life)? In the character of certain schools? In teacher and administrator attitudes and beliefs? In some combination of these? Do the low disproportionality schools tolerate more "deviance" among Blacks and males? Do the formal and informal rules and how they are enforced differ among schools? Do students simply cause more trouble in some schools than in others?

One way of separating the student and institutional variables that may influence school discipline problems is to identify some characteristics of student "disrupters," as distinguished from student "non-disrupters." Another is to study the characteristics of "high" and "low" disproportionality schools and to identify factors which might explain the differences in school discipline disproportionately among Blacks and males.

This research project has studied both student characteristics and school characteristics. Our aim was to identify explanations of disproportionality among Black and male student "disrupters," and to identify promising school practices and conditions which help mediate the problem. Too voluminous to be presented in a single paper, the findings are reported in three papers which focus on student characteristics (Bennett and Harris, 1981), school characteristics (Bennett, 1981) and teacher and administrator attitudes and beliefs (Reid, 1981).

Our research was conducted in two large urban school corporations, located in the midwest. Both corporations had previously been ranked among the country's one hundred most problematic school corporations concerning minorities and school discipline (HEW, 1976). Both corporations were concerned about the problem and agreed to participate in a study that would lead to programs designed to counter the problem of disproportionality in school discipline.

Each school corporation was treated as a totally separate research site, and all data were analyzed separately. However, the methodology and data collection techniques were nearly identical, and thus it was possible to examine the degree to which findings from the two separate school corporations would corroborate each other.

Our findings in the two different sites are, in fact, highly similar. The characteristics of "serious disrupters", as well as teacher attitudes and beliefs, are virtually identical. And, while some differences were discovered between the highest race disproportionality school in each site, the lowest race disproportionality schools were alike on most of the variables studied.

## I. Methodology and Data Source

### A. Overview

The study was conducted with the full cooperation of the central administration and building principals in both school corporations. Two Project Facilitators, one based in each school corporation, joined the project staff. These individuals proved to be invaluable liaisons, and were able to gain the parental permissions which allowed the

project staff to study student records in accordance with privacy regulations. They also provide access to statistics on school enrollments, student withdrawals, and student suspensions and expulsions. Data collection came from a variety of sources which include: taped interviews of students, parents, administrators, and teachers; student cumulative folders; school "discipline files;" paper-pencil questionnaires completed by students, teachers and administrators; and State Department statistics on enrollments, withdrawals, suspensions and expulsions, all broken down by school, sex and race.

The total number of high schools possible, five from one site and six from the other, participated in the study. All "serious disrupters," i.e. students who had been suspended three or more times and/or expelled from school, in each school corporation were identified (N = 322 and 362). Random samples of 100 and 110 students stratified by school, race, sex and grade level was selected from the population of "serious disrupters" in each district. Other random samples of 100 and 110 non-disrupters, again stratified by school, race and sex, were selected from the ninth, tenth and eleventh graders enrolled in each school. The family of each selected student was personally contacted for written permission to participate in the study. When permission was not obtained, another student was randomly selected.

A team of experienced interviewers was trained to conduct the interview using a common format. Interviewers and interviewees were

matched by race. Pairs of interviewers visited each home to conduct the parent and student interviews simultaneously and in separate rooms. The students also completed a paper-pencil questionnaire (ppq). A total of 210 student interviews and 210 parent interviews were completed; the interviews were taped, and later coded, and ranged from 30-60 minutes in length.

The remaining population of serious disrupters not interviewed was also studied. The following information was identified for all disrupters (N = 684) and recorded on Form A's whether or not they were interviewed: race, sex, GPA, grounds for suspension or expulsion, 8th grade reading and math achievement test scores, family structure and parent(s) occupation.

The student paper-pencil questionnaire (ppq) was also administered to a sample of 10-25% of the student population in each of the eleven high schools. Interviewees, the selected student "disrupters" and "non-disrupters," were not included in this sample.

Ten teachers and the top 3-4 administrators in each school were also interviewed. These administrators completed a pencil paper questionnaire as well. Finally, a randomly selected 20% of the teachers and students at each school (excluding those interviewed) also were asked to complete a paper pencil questionnaire.

Four interview formats were developed for this study by the project staff: an administrator, teacher, parent and student format. Although the formats differed, a common core of questions on student discipline used in previous research was included in each format, as was a common core on school desegregation. Three pencil paper questionnaire formats (for students, teachers and administrators) were also developed; most of the items had been used in previous research on school discipline and/or school desegregation (Bickel, 1979; Forehand and Ragosta, 1976; and Bennett, 1980).

Forms A and B were developed by the project staff to record personal history data on disruptive and non-disruptive students respectively. The forms were completed by members of the project staff who consulted student records (ie. cumulative folders and discipline files).

B. The Student Samples

1. Characteristics of Serious Disrupters in Site A: Interview Sample

Based on individual school discipline records, a total of 322 high school students were identified as having been suspended three

or more times and/or expelled from school during the 1979-80 school year. The personal records of each of these students were consulted and background information was gathered and recorded on Form A's. By far the most frequent grounds for charges brought against Black students were discretionary. Discretionary grounds include the following:

a. "Use of conduct which interferes with school purposes (violence, force, noise, coercion, etc.)." (Note: fighting, stealing, damaging property, and weapon possession were not included here.)

j. "Failure to comply with directions of teachers when judged to be interferring with school purposes," and

l. "Violation, or repeated violation, of school rules validly adopted." (Note: Fighting, stealing, damaging property, and weapon possession were <u>not</u> included here.)

The most frequent grounds for charges brought against White students were truancy, followed by discretionary and drugs. Stealing, fighting, and weapon possession were relatively infrequent grounds against any student, but all three were brought against Blacks more often than against Whites. On the other hand, drug charges and truancy were much more common charges for White than Black students (Bennett and Harris, 1981a).

The findings on curriculum must be viewed with caution since this information was not available in 75 of the 322 cases. However, most Black student disrupters were enrolled in a general or vocational curriculum. This pattern was also true for White student disrupters, although college prep and business programs also emerged. Only one student was enrolled in special education.

Overall, more than half of these students live with two parents, when the remarried parents are included. However, among Black student "disrupters" more than half live in homes with a divorced single parent.

Unfortunately, reading and math achievement test scores were not recorded for a large number of student "disrupters." Thus, the figures are only suggestive. Considering those students for whom the scores were available it is clear that a good number had scored below grade level on eighth grade achievement tests. This was markedly true among Black students, as compared with Whites, over half of whom scored at or above grade level on reading.

2. Characteristics of the Student Population Cross-Sections (PPQ Sample) in Sites A and B: PPQ Sample

In site A, the ppq sample (N = 727) may be characterized as college prep students who evaluate themselves as average to above average students with the ability to succeed in college. The vaste majority of their parents have not attended a PTA meeting, most know a school adult who will help when they are in trouble, and the vaste majority have never been in a fight at school. Approximately two-thirds live with both parents, take a newspaper at home, and have mothers with a high school or college education. The sample is

predominantly White, with only 68 of the 727 students being Black. Only 85 of the sample reported one or more suspensions.

The student ppq sample (N = 1324) in Site B appears to be a truer representation of the total student population than in Site A. The Site B sample is characterized by students who are dispersed across all of the curriculum areas, and who see themselves as average to somewhat above average students with "probable" ability to succeed in college.

The sample is a good cross-section of the school community in terms of sex and race. Approximately 10% report having been in a fight "this year," and 20% have been suspended at least once. Thus, while the sample may not be totally random, neither is it "hand picked." As is true in Site A, most ppq students have parents who have not attended a PTA meeting, most have never been suspended or in a fight, and most receive a newspaper at home. School differences were noted within the student ppq samples on a number of selected student characteristics. Most of these differences were "school" based, rather than related to family conditions, and are discussed elsewhere (Bennett, 1981).

The focus of this paper is the characteristics of "high and low" disproportionality schools. Reported elsewhere is our study of characteristics which distinguishes serious disrupters from non-disruptive students (Bennett and Harris, 1981).

II. Findings

A. Overview of Findings on Disproportionality in School Discipline

The GINI Index of Dissimilarity was used to examine the degree to which disproportionate numbers of male and/or Black students comprised the serious disrupter population. As used in this study's context, the GINI Index identifies the proportion of Black and male disrupters which would need to be redistributed among White and female disrupters in order to eliminate disproportionality. Tables 1a and 2a display the GINI indices for each of the five high schools in Site A, and Tables 1b and 2b display the indices for each school in Site B.

(Insert Tables 1a and 1b)

(Insert Tables 2a and 2b)

These findings show a disproportionately high number of Black and male "serious disrupters" in each of the eleven high schools. However, there are striking differences in the degree of disproportionality within the different schools, particularly with regard to Black students.

For Site A, Table 1a identifies School Five as having the highest level of race disproportionality and School Two the lowest. The number of Black and White "disrupters" in School Five is almost equal, even though Black students comprise only 1/12 of the total student population. The GINI Index for School Five is .415, meaning that in order to eliminate racial disproportionality, nearly half of the Black serious disrupters would need to be White. In School Two the GINI Index is much lower (.075) indicating that approximately 7½ percent

of the Black disrupters would need to be White in order to eliminate racial disproportionality. School One has the second lowest GINI Index (.112), and Schools Three and Four are fairly similar with GINI indices of .162 and .144 respectively.

Table 2a shows that males are also over-represented among the "serious disrupters". In no other school is the level of disproportionality among males as high as it is among Blacks in School Five. However, except for School Five the disproportionality level for males in all schools is higher than for Blacks, particularly in Schools Three and Four. School Two again emerges as the school with the lowest level of disproportionality.

The findings for Site B also show a disproportionately high number of Black and male "serious disrupters" in each of the six high schools. However, there are again clear differences in the degree of disproportionality within the different schools. Table 1b identifies Schools One, Two and Three as having relatively high levels of race disproportionality, with School Three being highest. School Five reflects a strikingly low level of disproportionality. (However, for the school corporation as a whole, this school also has the highest number of "serious disrupters" for both Black and White students. There are over three times as many Black disrupters and seven times as many White disrupters in School Five as compared with School Three which is most comparable in size.) The number of Black and White "disrupters" in Schools One and Three is almost equal, even though Black students comprise only about one-fifth and one-sixth of the respective total school populations. The GINI Index for School

Three is .298, meaning that in order to eliminate racial disproportionality nearly a third of the Black serious disrupters would need to be White. In Schools One and Two, approximately one quarter of the Black "serious disrupters" would need to be White in order to eliminate racial disproportionality. In School Five the GINI Index is much lower (.036) indicating that approximately 3½ percent of the Black disrupters would need to be White in order to eliminate racial disproportionality. School Six has the second lowest GINI Index (.110) and School Four the third lowest (.193).

Table 2b shows that males are also over-represented among the "serious disrupters" in Site B. However, the degree of sex disproportionality is lower than that of race disproportionality in each school except Schools Five and Six. School One shows the lowest level of sex disproportionality with a GINI Index of .025, and School Three is again the highest with an Index of .271.

As schools work harder to retain students who might otherwise drop out at age sixteen, they may also be increasing their number of "discipline problems." Ironically, those schools which do the least for problem students may experience fewer discipline problems because potential disrupters drop out. Thus one possible explanation for the striking school differences in race and sex disproportionality among "disrupters" is that levels of student withdrawals may be highest in schools where disproportionality among disrupters is lowest. Possibly, in some schools more students drop out prior to being suspended or expelled than in other schools.

The State Department figures on student withdrawals (broken down by race only) for the 1978-79 school year do not support this conclusion. In fact, as shown in Tables 3a-4b, the student withdrawal figures are largely consistent with the figures on frequent suspension and expulsion.

For the corporation in Site A as a whole, a disproportionately high number of Black students withdraw from school. There are again differences between schools, with Schools 1 and 2 again having the lowest level of disproportionality. School 5, the school with the highest level of racial disproportionality among student disrupters, had the second highest level of disproportionality in Black student withdrawals. School 4, with a relatively low GINI Index for Race of .144, has the highest level of disproportionality among Black student withdrawals. This suggests that, at least for School 4, the high level of withdrawals among Black students may explain their relatively low representation among "serious disrupters". The opposite may be true for School 1, where the percent of Black student withdrawal is 2.9% less than what could be expected based on their proportion of the student population.

Given the fact that 70-80% of the Black students in Site A come from the same neighborhood, School Two's low levels of disproportionality among Black student disruptions and withdrawals seems significant. Perhaps there are lessons to be learned here.

An analysis of student withdrawals in Site B shows that there is less race and sex disproportionality among "drop outs" than among "serious disrupters" in all six high schools, with the slight exception of male disrupters in School Five.

(Insert Table 3b)

(Insert Table 4b)

While all of the schools' GINI Indices are relatively low, the GINI Index for student withdrawals by race shows the highest degree of disproportionality in Schools Two and Four (.155 and .132 respectively, and the lowest level in School Five (at .007). Schools Three and Six also show a low GINI Index, with disproportionality being under 2%. Concerning the indices of disproportionality in withdrawals by sex, the highest level is in School Five and the lowest levels are in Schools One and Six where the index is less than 1%. These findings show that there is consistently less disproportionality in student withdrawals than in "serious disrupters" in Site B, for both race and sex. However, the withdrawal figures are consistent with the "disrupter" figures in that each school shows disproportionately high numbers of Black and male student withdrawals. These figures also show that over ten percent of the high school population dropped out during the 1979-80 school year.

B. Identification of the "High" and "Low" Disproportionality Schools

In Site A, School Two emerged as the "low" disproportionality school. The GINI Index of Dissimilarity was lowest in this school for both race and sex. School Five emerged as the "high"

disproportionality school in Site A. The GINI Index of Dissimilarity for Race is dramatically higher in School Five than in the remaining four site A schools, and is higher than any school's in Site B. School Five's GINI Index for sex falls into the cluster of top three in Site A.

School Five emerged as the "low" disproportionality school in Site B. The GINI Index of Dissimilarity in this school is lowest of the eleven for race, and one of the lowest for sex. School Three emerged as the "high" disproportionality school in Site B. The GINI Index is highest here for both race and sex though the pattern of school differences is less dramatic in Site B than in Site A. In both sites the "low" disproportionality school was clearly identifiable and in Site A, the "high" race disproportionality school was also clearly identifiable. In Site B, no one school emerged as dramatically higher in race disproportionality (i.e. the cluster of three), but the overall level of race disproportionality was higher in Site B than in Site A.

Even though we are primarily interested in characteristics that help distinguish between the "high" and "low" disproportionately schools, data will be presented for the five schools in Site A and the six schools in Site B. This is particularly appropriate for Site B where the levels of race disproportionality is relatively high in three schools.

C. Comparison of "High" and "Low" Disproportionality Schools on Selected Variables

1. Transportation to School

School busing is often perceived as a factor which explains the disproportionate numbers of Black students disciplined in many desegregated schools. Often assumed is that student discipline problems are more frequent and severe in the schools with high proportions of bused students.

Table 5 displays the number of students in the ppq sample who arrive at school by foot or bike, bus, or car. To the degree that the student ppq samples are representative of their respective schools, these figures identify the pattern of transportation mode for the student population in each school.

Our findings show that busing is not the explanatory factor in either school corporation. In Site A, the "high" and "low" race disproportionality schools both show the highest level of busing. In fact, the number of students in each transportation category is very similar in these two schools.

In Site B, Schools Five and Six, the two lowest race disproportionality schools show the lowest and highest number of students being bused respectively. School Three, the highest in the cluster schools with high levels of race disproportionality, shows a high proportion of students being bused as does School One but not School Two. Furthermore, the lowest disproportionality school, which also has the lowest number of students bused, shows the highest overall frequency of student disruptions.

2. Other Selected Variables

Also frequently assumed is that variables such as: mother's education level, family structure (e.g. divorce), home ownership, college plans and a newspaper in the home are important variables that relate to student discipline. None of these variables appeared to be significantly different in any of the schools, with a few exceptions (Bennett and Harris, 1981). In Site A, the lowest disproportionality school showed mother's educational level to be lower and home ownership to be less frequent. In Site B, the two lowest disproportionality schools showed the highest number of "broken homes," and one of them (School 6) also showed the lowest number of students who planned to attend college.

3. The Self Indices: Fatalism, Dislike School and Unfair Punishment

All of the ppq items with a personal or self focus were factor analyzed. Three factors emerged and were used as separate indicators.

a. Fatalism Index

Ten items were found to comprise the Fatalism Index. These same items have been used extensively in other research to measure locus of control or the degree to which an individual believes s/he has control over his or her destiny, and are the following:

> When bad things are going to happen, they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them.
>
> 1. agree
> 2. disagree
>
> On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
>
> 1. agree
> 2. disagree

Good luck is just as important for success as hard work is.

1. agree
2. disagree

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

1. agree
2. disagree

Some kids are just naturally lucky.

1. agree
2. disagree

I feel like I don't really belong in this school.

1. agree
2. disagree

When I make plans, I am almost sure I can make them work.

1. agree
2. disagree

Most people are better off than I am.

1. agree
2. disagree

Most of the time it doesn't pay to try hard because things never turn out right anyway.

1. agree
2. disagree

Everything considered are you happy, pretty happy, or not too happy these days?

1. very happy
2. pretty happy
3. not too happy

These items were scored such that a high score indicated a high degree of "fatalism," or a feeling of lack of personal control over the environment.

No significant school differences on Fatalism were discovered in Site A. However in Site B significant differences between schools

were discovered on the Fatalism Index (see Table 6b). Students scored highest on Fatalism in School Two and lowest in School Six. This suggests that students attending these schools may have differing degrees of the sense of locus of control. Since fatalism is a deeply rooted psychological orientation, the fact the students express lowest levels in Schools Five and Six (the lowest disproportionality schools) and highest levels in School Two suggests that the socio-emotional nature of the student population in their schools may warrant further study.

b. Dislike School Index

The five following ppq items emerged as one factor which was labeled as a Dislike School Index.

81. Do you like the principal of this school?

1. yes
2. no
3. I don't know

82. Do you think you will go to college?

1. yes
2. no

83. In the morning, are you usually glad to go to school?

1. yes
2. no

86. Do you hate school?

1. yes
2. no

87. Do you usually hate school?

1. yes
2. no

These items were scored such that a high score meant dislike of principal, no college plans, not glad to attend school, hate and usually hate school

The school differences were significant in Site A. Schools Three and Five are above the population mean on the Dislike School Index, while Schools Two and Four are below the mean (see Table 7a). Assuming this index is a valid indicator of pupil affect, students seem most positive about school in Schools Two (the "low" disproportionality school) and Four and least positive in Schools Three and Five (the "high" disproportionality school). School One is above the mean, but there is a large amount of variance which suggests many of the students sampled felt positive about school and many others felt negative.

In Site B, no significant differences were discovered between schools on the Dislike School Index.

c. Unfair Punishment Index

The following two items formed a separate factor and were labeled the Unfair Punishment Index:

84. When you get punished at school, does it usually seem it's for no good reason at all?

1. yes
2. no
3. I have never been punished

85. Compared to other students you know, do you feel you get punished fairly?

1. yes
2. no
3. I haven't been punished at school

The higher the score the higher the feeling that punishment occurs for no good reason and is unfair in comparison with classmates.

As shown in Tables 8a and 8b, the differences between the schools are significant in both sites. In Site A, Schools Two and Four are again below the population mean while Schools One, Three and Five

are again above. Apparently more students in Schools Two and Four feel school punishment is fair than in the other schools.

In Site B, the Unfair Punishment score is highest in Schools Two, Three and Four, lowest in Schools One and Six, and at the mean in School Five. Apparently, more students in Schools One and Six feel school punishment is fair, while more tend to see it as unfair in Schools Three, Four and Two.

These findings show that students perceive more unfair punishment in the "high" than in the "low" disproportionality schools.

4. The Power Indices: Institutional Power and Grassroots Power

Eight ppq items which dealt with how much influence the student felt different groups of persons have in his or her school were factor analyzed (Items 91-99 on the ppq). Two factors emerged: Institutional Power and Grassroots Power. Institutional Power represents the influence of the school board, superintendent and principal. Grassroots Power represents the influence of the self, students and parents. No factor emerged to represent teachers and assistant principals, whose influence seemed to rest somewhere between the two other groups.

The Power Indices proved to be powerful indicators of difference in Site A. The breakdowns by school were highly significant on both Institutional and Grassroots Power indices (See Tables 9a and 10a).

Institutional Power was above the population mean in Schools Two, Three and Five. In these schools, the school board, superintendent and principal were perceived to be relatively powerful. However, as shown in Table 10a the Grassroots Power Index for School Two is also well above the population mean. Thus, when students perceive influence

on the part of the School Board, Superintendent, and Principal, this does not necessarily mean selves, students and parents are perceived to be without power. Schools One and Four are below the population mean on institutional power, suggesting that the School Board, Superintendent and Principal are perceived to be less powerful by students in these schools than in the other schools.

Significant school differences were also found in student perceptions of grassroots power (see Table 10a). Schools One and Two were well above the population mean, Schools Three and Four were well below, and School Five was slightly above.

In Site B, there is a trend showing that Grassroots Power is stronger in Schools Five and Six (the low disproportionality schools) than in the remaining four schools (see Table 10b). No significant differences or trends were discovered between schools on the Institutional Power Index. Overall, the students in all six high schools tend to have similar perceptions of the school board, superintendent, and principal's power. The Institutional Power mean is slightly higher than the mean in Site A, where school differences on Institutional Power were noted. However, significant school differences in teacher perceptions were discovered (Heid, 1981). Teachers perceived higher levels of both student power and administrator power in the low disproportionality school, and lower levels of each in the "high" disproportionality school.

Students in Schools Five and Six, (the low disproportionality schools) and students who have never been suspended perceive relatively

more school influence for themselves, other students and parents than do their counterparts (Bennett and Harris, 1981). Thus, their perceptions of relatively strong institutional power is not at the expense of their own sense of school efficacy. Once+ suspended students tend to perceive low levels of both institutional and personal influence in their school.

5. Positive School Climate Index

Questions 12-25 on the ppq comprised a single factor which was labeled the Positive School Climate Index. These items were scored so that the higher an index score is, the more positive are feelings about school climate. Significant differences were found between the schools in both sites (see Tables 11a and 11b).

In Site A, the School Climate Index is above the population mean for Schools One and Four, at the mean for School Two, and below the mean for Schools Three and Five. Apparently, students in Schools One and Four feel most positive about their school environment, while students in Schools Three and Five (the high disproportionality schools) feel least positive.

In Site B, the Positive School Climate Index is highest in Schools Five and Three and lowest in Schools Two and One. The index is also above the mean in Schools Four and Six. Apparently, students in Schools Five and Three (the lowest and highest disproportionality schools) feel most positive about their school environment, while students in Schools One and Two (relatively high race disproportionality schools) feel least positive.

6. The School Desegregation Indices: Interracial Environment, Interracial Friendship, and White Predominance.

Questions 26-63 on the ppq dealt with school desegregation. These items were factor analyzed and yielded three factors: Interracial Environment, Interracial Friendship, and White Predominance.

a. Interracial Environment

The following items comprised the Interracial Environment Index:

32. If you could choose the kind of school you would go to, would you pick one with

    1. all white students
    2. all black students
    3. a mixture of different kinds of students

33. Do you think your friends would think badly of you if you went someplace after school with a student of a different race?

    1. yes
    2. no

57. How uncomfortable do you feel around students of a different race?

    1. generally very uncomfortable
    2. generally somewhat uncomfortable
    3. occasionally somewhat uncomfortable
    4. not at all uncomfortable

58. Are the student government officers in this school all of the same racial group, or are they different groups?

    1. all of the same racial group
    2. different groups

59. Are the cheerleaders in your school all of the same racial group, or are they from different groups?

    1. all of the same racial group
    2. different groups

60. How often do you have class discussions about race relations?

    1. about once a week or more often
    2. about once a month
    3. every few months
    4. no such discussions so far

61. In general, do you think that white people are smarter than black people, that black people are smarter than white people, or do you think that a person's color doesn't have anything to do with how smart he is?

    1. white people are smarter
    2. black people are smarter
    3. color doesn't have anything to do with smartness

62. The way things are going between blacks and whites in this school, do you think things will be better or worse next year?

    1. better
    2. same
    3. worse

These items were scored so that more points were given for choices indicating support for interracial interaction. The index was believed to measure the student's and the school's support for an interracial school environment.

Significant race/sex differences emerged on all of the desegregation indices. Therefore, the results will be displayed by race/sex group for each school.

Tables 12a and 12b show that White males scored lowest on the Interracial Environment Index in both sites. In Site A, Black and White females and Black males all scored above the population mean. In Site B, Black and White females scored above the population mean and Black males scored slightly below. These results indicate that White male students feel least comfortable around non-White students, tend to see Whites as being smarter and do not report school activities which support interracial relations.

In Site A, the differences between the race/sex groups on the Interracial Environment Index are significant by school (see Table 13a). Among White males and White females the Index is lowest in Schools

Three and Five, indicating less support for an interracial environment in these schools. The Index is highest, for White males, in School Two, and for White females in Schools Two and Four. The sample sizes of Black males and females are small, yet the same pattern emerges showing the Index to be highest in School Two and lowest in Schools Three and Five (with the exception of one Black female in School Five).

In Site B there is a trend showing the strongest interracial environments in Schools One and Five and the least support for an interracial environment in School Three (Table 13b). The Interracial Environment Index mean was lowest in School Three, highest in Schools Five and One, and very near the total population mean in the remaining schools. Thus students perceive the strongest interracial environment in the low disproportionality school and the weakest interracial environment in the high disproportionality school.

b. Interracial Friendship

The Index of Interracial Friendship differs from the Interracial Environment Index in that it measures interracial relations of a more personal nature such as phone conversations, seeking help on homework, and the desire for friends of a different race. The factor which was converted into this index consists of four items:

29. Have you ever called a student of a different race on the phone?

    1. yes
    2. no

30. This school year, have you helped a student from another race with school work?

    1. yes
    2. no

31. This school year, have you asked a student from another race to help you with your homework?

    1. yes
    2. no

34. Would you like to have more friends who are of a different race?

    1. yes
    2. no

These were scored so that a high score indicated interracial mix.

As shown in Table 14a and 14b White and Black males in Site A showed the highest level of interracial mixing, while Black and White females showed the lowest level. The low level of interracial mix was strongest among Black females. Table 17 shows that in Site B White males again showed the highest level of interracial mixing of a personal nature, and Black females showed the lowest level. Both Black males and White females were slightly below the population mean in Site B.

Significant school differences on the Interracial Friendship Index were discovered in both Sites (see Table 15a). In Site A, among Black and White males (the two groups reporting the greatest interracial interaction of a personal nature) the Interracial Friendship Index is lowest in Schools Five and Three for White males and lowest in Schools Five and Four for Black males. The Index is highest in School Two for Black males and in Schools One and Two for White males. These findings show that the most interracial interaction based upon students' personal interaction and school support (e.g. class discussions, student government) occurs in the low race disproportionality school (School Two), while the least interracial interactions occur in Schools Five and Three, the high disproportionality schools.

In Site B, the Index is lowest in School One, highest in School Three, and relatively close to the total population mean in the remaining four schools. Thus we find the strongest degree of interracial friendship among students, in School Three, the highest race disproportionality school (see Tables 15b and 15c).

c. Administration Support Index

Two items on the student ppq were used to tap student perceptions of how school administrators felt about school desegregation. The items are the following:

Once again, these items were scored so that high scores indicated support for desegregation.

As shown in Table 16b, significant school differences were discovered on the Administration Support Index in Site B only. The Index was lowest in Schools One, Two, and Three and highest in Schools Four, Five and Six. Apparently students in Schools Four, Five and Six perceive their school administrators to be more supportive of school desegregation than do students in the remaining three schools.

d. The White Predominance Index

Students were asked, "How likely is it that a black student will participate in the following activities?"

35. Play on a football team

36. Play on the chess team

37. Give own idea in class

38. Serve on a school committee
39. Be a cheerleader
40. Win a scholarship
41. Belong to the scholarship club
42. Play in the band
43. Play in the orchestra
44. Be in the school government
45. Take leading roles in a school play
46. Take an advanced math class
47. Take auto mechanics
48. Take a foreign language
49. Take home economics
50. Take typing
51. Give a speech in an assembly
52. Sing in a glee club or choir
53. Play on the basketball team

For each item, students were asked whether the activity was:

1. more likely of a White student
2. more likely of a Black student
3. Black and White students just as likely

A response of "one" was scored three points, three was scored two points, and a two was scored one point. This scoring decision was based on the basic frequency data (see Table 23), which showed a strong tendency for students to perceive Whites rather than Blacks as more likely to participate in most of the activities.

It is difficult to determine whether students' responses to these items were based on their perceptions of the innate or developed potential of Black and White students, or whether they were reporting the school realities which could stem from factors related to the school. However, in view of the clear differences discovered between White males on one hand and White females, and Black males and females on the other hand, the former explanation is more likely (see Tables 18a and 18b). It seems less plausible that White males, White females, and Black males and females would perceive differently the number of Blacks who participate in school activities than that their basic racial attitudes differ. However, the fact that clear significant school differences emerged along with the race/sex differences indicates that both psychological and school factors are involved (see Tables 17a and 17b).

In Site A, White males do score highest on the White Predominance Index, but their scores are highest in School Five and lowest in School Two. The same school differences emerged for Black males and females, and (except for School Three) White females.

White males also score highest on the White Predominance Index in Site B, but their scores are highest in School Four and lowest in School Five. Schools Three and Four show the highest White Predominance Index among White females; among Black males the Index is highest in Schools One and Three, and among Black females Four and Six show the highest White predominance Index. For all race/sex groups the Index is low in School Five.

These findings suggest that "white predominance" is strongest in the high disproportionality schools and weakest in the low disproportionality schools. Assuming that this scale is one indicator of a racist orientation (i.e. the belief that Whites are more likely to participate in certain activities because of innately superior abilities) then the White male students surveyed are more racist than their Black and White female classmates. The school differences may be explained either by the existence of informal and/or formal school practices which tend to exclude Black students from various activities in some schools, by the fact that White students may come from neighborhoods of different racial attitudes, by differences in students' interests and abilities, by different attitudes within the home about participation in various school activities, or (most likely) some combination of these. Further study is necessary to clarify the reasons for these school and race/sex group differences.

Summary

This research identifies some variables which help distinguish between schools showing high and low levels of disproportionality in school discipline. The findings are clearest in Site A where the indices of dissimilarity were most distinct and identified School Two as the "low" disproportionality school and School Five as the "high" disproportionality school. School Five, along with School Three (the second highest disproportionality school), was characterized by:

a. the highest levels of race disproportionality among student "disrupters"

b. high levels of race disproportionality in student withdrawals

c. highest scores on the Dislike School Index

d. lowest scores on the Fair Punishment Index

e. high scores on the Institutional Power Index

f. lowest (School Three) and average scores on the Grassroots Power Index

g. lowest scores on the Positive School Climate Index

h. lowest scores on Interracial Environment

i. lowest scores on Interracial Friendship, and

j. highest scores on White Predominance

School Two, the "low" disproportionality school, presents a sharp contrast. Here students score lowest on Unfair Punishment. They also score high on both institutional and grassroots power, and score at the mean on Positive School Climate. The pattern concerning the school desegregation indices in School Two is striking. Students here score highest on Interracial Environment and Interracial Friendship, and lowest on White Predominance. Noteworthy is the fact that School Two had a Black Assistant Principal who was appointed to the Principalship just prior to the study. She was the only Black principal among the eleven participating schools. This fact, along with our findings, support the conclusions of Forehand and Rogosta (1976) that strong institutional support is a key factor in effective school integration.

In Site B, the differences between "high" and "low" disproportionality schools were less clearcut. This would be expected since three schools clustered in the "high" disproportionality range. A pair of schools emerged as "low" disproportionality schools, and one was clearly the

lowest of the eleven schools studied. Nevertheless, many of the findings on school characteristics in Site B corroborate the findings in Site A.

In Site B, the "low" disproportionality schools, (Schools Five and Six) are characterized by stronger feelings of personal efficacy, feelings that school punishment is fair and reasonable, and stronger perceptions of "student power" in school. No significant school differences were discovered among students on Dislike School or Institutional Power. School Three, the "high" disproportionality school was characterized by the highest student scores on both Unfair Punishment and Positive School Climate. However, Schools One and Two, which clustered with School Three as a "high" disproportionality school, scored lowest on Positive School Climate.

As was true in Site A, the school desegregation indices established clear differences between the "high" and "low" disproportionality schools. School Three, the "high" disproportionality school, scored lowest on Interracial Environment, lowest on Administration Support for School Desegregation, and highest on White Predominance. Interestingly these students also scored highest on Interracial Friendship.

In the "low" disproportionality schools, Schools Five and Six, students scored highest on Interracial Environment, highest on Administrator Support, and lowest on White Predominance.

We cannot at this point determine the extent to which these school differences on the school desegregation indices are due to different psychological orientations among the student population

and/or different school practices. Nevertheless it is clear that the school desegregation variables we studied are related to race disproportionality in school discipline.

These findings, plus portions of this research presented elsewhere (Bennett and Harris, 1981, and 1981a and Heid, 1981) support the position that the schools themselves are to some large degree responsible for the disproportionate numbers of males and Blacks who are disciplined in our schools. There is a small but consistent body of research which documents this conclusion (e.g. Arnove, 1980; Bickel, 1980; Forehand and Rogosta, 1976; Mood, 1980).

Table 1a

Race Disproportionality of "Serious Disrupter" in Site B by School GINI Index of Dissimilarity

| | | Disrupter | | Non-Disrupter | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School 1 | B | 14 | .112 | 293 | 307 |
| | W | 29 | | 1,078 | 1,107 |
| School 2 | B | 12 | .075 | 129 | 141 |
| | W | 72 | | 1,780 | 1,852 |
| School 3 | B | 21 | .162 | 210 | 231 |
| | W | 55 | | 1,623 | 1,678 |
| School 4 | B | 12 | .144 | 153 | 165 |
| | W | 38 | | 1,434 | 1,472 |
| School 5 | B | 34 | .415 | 132 | 166 |
| | W | 35 | | 1,563 | 1,598 |

Table 2a

Race Disproportionality of "Serious Disrupter" in Site B
by School GINI Index of Dissimilarity

| | | Disrupter | | Non-Disrupter | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School 1 | Males | 29 | .173 | 688 | 717 |
| | Females | 14 | | 683 | 697 |
| School 2 | Males | 50 | .086 | 972 | 1,022 |
| | Females | 34 | | 937 | 971 |
| School 3 | Males | 59 | .290 | 892 | 951 |
| | Females | 17 | | 941 | 958 |
| School 4 | Males | 39 | .265 | 817 | 856 |
| | Females | 11 | | 770 | 781 |
| School 5 | Males | 51 | .220 | 880 | 931 |
| | Females | 18 | | 815 | 833 |

Table 1b

Race Disproportionality of "Serious Disrupter" in Site B
by School GINI Index of Dissimilarity

| School | GINI Index | | Disrupter | Non Disrupter | Tot |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .242 | B | 9 | 241 | 250 |
| | | W | 11 | 918 | 929 |
| 2 | .237 | B | 6 | 123 | 129 |
| | | W | 11 | 938 | 949 |
| 3 | .298 | B | 13 | 316 | 329 |
| | | W | 16 | 1780 | 1796 |
| 4 | .193 | B | 17 | 175 | 192 |
| | | W | 38 | 1326 | 1364 |
| 5 | .036 | B | 46 | 320 | 366 |
| | | W | 113 | 942 | 1055 |
| 6 | .110 | B | 25 | 234 | 259 |
| | | W | 57 | 965 | 1022 |

Table 2b

Sex Disproportionality of "Serious Disrupters" in Site B
by School GINI Index of Dissimilarity

| School | GINI Index | | Disrupter | Non Disrupter | Tot |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .242 | M | 11 | 609 | 620 |
| | | F | 9 | 550 | 559 |
| 2 | .115 | M | 7 | 559 | 566 |
| | | F | 10 | 502 | 512 |
| 3 | .271 | M | 23 | 1094 | 1117 |
| | | F | 6 | 1002 | 1008 |
| 4 | .172 | M | 38 | 774 | 812 |
| | | F | 17 | 717 | 734 |
| 5 | .134 | M | 100 | 624 | 724 |
| | | F | 59 | 638 | 697 |
| 6 | .225 | M | 58 | 650 | 658 |
| | | F | 22 | 601 | 623 |

Table 3a

Withdrawal Data of Site A School Corporation High S
for the 1978-79 School Year***

| | Population by Race | | | Withdrawals by Race | | | % To an | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Black | |
| School | B | W | *Total | B | W | Total | % of Total Pop. | % of Total Withdrawals |
| 1 | 314 | 1,231 | 1,552 | 44 | 209 | 253 | 20.2 | 17.3 |
| 2 | 140 | 1,996 | 2,146 | 22 | 200 | 222 | 6.5 | 9.9 |
| 3 | 196 | 1,667 | 1,876 | 21 | 110 | 131 | 10.4 | 16.0 |
| 4 | 154 | 1,489 | 1,652 | 23 | 106 | 129 | 9.3 | 17.8 |
| 5 | 180 | 1,686 | 1,859 | 29 | 139 | 168 | 9.6 | 17.2 |
| Corporation Total | 984 | 8,069 | 9,085 | 139 | 764 | 903 | 10.8 | 15.3 |

*Totals include minorities other than Black, designated as:
-American Indian/Alaskan Native
-Asian/Pacific Islander American
-Spanish Surnamed American (Hispanic)

**(+) = Disproportionate Impact
(-) = No disproportionate Impact

***Source: Table is developed from original data supplied by the Department of Public Ins

site A School Corporation High Schools
he 1978-79 School Year***

| | % of Total Population and Total Withdrawals by Race and Impact (+) or (-) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Black | | | White | | |
| Total | % of Total Pop. | % of Total Withdrawals | **Impact | % of Total Pop. | % of Total Withdrawals | **Impact |
| 253 | 20.2 | 17.3 | -2.9 | 79.3 | 82.6 | +3.3 |
| 222 | 6.5 | 9.9 | +3.4 | 93.0 | 90.0 | -3.0 |
| 131 | 10.4 | 16.0 | +5.6 | 88.8 | 83.9 | -4.9 |
| 129 | 9.3 | 17.8 | +8.5 | 90.1 | 82.1 | -8.0 |
| | 9.6 | 17.2 | +7.5 | 90.6 | 82.2 | -8.4 |
| 903 | 10.8 | 15.3 | +4.5 | 88.8 | 84.6 | -4.2 |

as:

! by the Department of Public Instruction, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Table 3b

Race Disproportionality in Student Withdrawals
GINI Index and Total B & W Withdrawals by Race and Sex for
1979-80 School Year, Site B

| School | Black | | | | White | | | | GINI Index |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Tot E | OW ↓ | OW + | Tot W | Tot E | OW ↓ | OW + | Tot W | |
| 1 | 250 | 19 | 23 | 42 | 929 | 60 | 46 | 106 | .086 |
| 2 | 129 | 27 | 22 | 49 | 949 | 94 | 56 | 150 | .155 |
| 3 | 329 | 17 | 14 | 31 | 1796 | 97 | 56 | 153 | .015 |
| 4 | 192 | 14 | 9 | 23 | 1364 | 45 | 25 | 70 | .132 |
| 5 | 366 | 30 | 38 | 68 | 1055 | 137 | 53 | 190 | .007 |
| 6 | 259 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 1022 | 51 | 37 | 88 | .019 |
| Tot | | | | 233 | | | | 757 | |

Table 4b

Sex Disproportionality in Student Withdrawals
GINI Index and Total Enrollments and Number of Withdrawals
by Sex for 1979-80 School Year. Site B

| School | Male | | | | Female | | | | GINI Index |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Tot E | BD | WD | Tot W | Tot E | BD | WD | Tot W | |
| 1 | 620 | 19 | 60 | 79 | 559 | 23 | 46 | 69 | .009 |
| 2 | 566 | 27 | 94 | 121 | 512 | 22 | 56 | 78 | .102 |
| 3 | 1117 | 17 | 97 | 114 | 1008 | 14 | 56 | 70 | .103 |
| 4 | 812 | 14 | 45 | 59 | 734 | 9 | 25 | 34 | .116 |
| 5 | 724 | 30 | 137 | 167 | 697 | 38 | 53 | 91 | .168 |
| 6 | 658 | 5 | 51 | 51 | 623 | 15 | 37 | 52 | .005 |
| Tot | | | | 591 | | | | 394 | |

Table 5

Student Modes of Transportation to School by School

| School | Walk/bike | Bus | Car | Walk/bike | Bus | Car |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 13 | 70 | 19 | 128* | 82 |
| 2 | 14 | 51** | 84 | 50 | 12* | 130 |
| 3 | 10 | 28 | 25 | 10 | 114* | 79 |
| 4 | 11 | 39 | 133 | 30 | 42 | 126 |
| 5 | 15 | 66* | 83 | 100 | 10** | 98 |
| 6 | | | | 14 | 134** | 80 |

**Signifies "low" race disproportionality school

*Signifies "high" race disproportionality school

Table 6b

Analysis of Variance:Fatalism Index By School

| School | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6.8632 | 1.0751 | ( 190) |
| 2 | 7.5143 | 3.8254 | ( 210) |
| 3 | 7.0512 | 2.5709 | ( 215) |
| 4 | 6.8333 | .9683 | ( 204) |
| 5 | 6.8128 | 1.2027 | ( 219) |
| 6 | 6.5745 | 1.5407 | ( 235) |
| Tot | | 6.9356 | ( 1273) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 110.2772 | ( 5) |
| Within Groups | 5752.4408 | ( 1267) |
| Total | 5862.7180 | ( 1272) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

F = 4.8578 SIG. = .0002

Table 7a

Analysis of Variance:
Dislike School Index Broken Down by School in Site A

| | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| School 1 | 6.9832 | 3.3344 | ( 119) |
| School 2 | 6.7320 | 1.3179 | ( 153) |
| School 3 | 7.0317 | 1.1635 | ( 63) |
| School 4 | 6.4620 | 1.4214 | ( 184) |
| School 5 | 7.0482 | 1.6098 | ( 166) |
| Total | 6.8073 | 1.9105 | ( 685) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 39.2994 | ( 4) | 9.8248 |
| Within Groups | 2457.2641 | ( 680) | 3.6136 |
| Total | 2496.5635 | ( 684) | |

F = 2.7188 SIG. = .0288

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 8a

Analysis of Variance:
Unfair Punishment Index Broken Down By School
in Site A

| | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| School 1 | 4.7542 | 2.1758 | ( 118) |
| School 2 | 4.5669 | 1.7070 | ( 157) |
| School 3 | 4.8615 | 1.3449 | ( 65) |
| School 4 | 4.2434 | 1.7023 | ( 189) |
| School 5 | 4.6118 | 1.5002 | ( 170) |
| Total | 4.5494 | 1.7259 | ( 699) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 29.6920 | ( 4) | 7.4230 |
| Within Groups | 2049.3552 | ( 694) | 2.9530 |
| Total | 2079.0472 | ( 698) | |

F = 2.5137 SIG. = .0405

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 8b

Analysis of Variance
Unfair Punishment by School

| School | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4.3246 | 1.5692 | ( 191) |
| 2 | 4.7115 | 1.9320 | ( 208) |
| 3 | 4.7870 | 1.5615 | ( 216) |
| 4 | 4.7317 | 1.5053 | ( 205) |
| 5 | 4.5388 | 1.4876 | ( 219) |
| 6 | 4.3234 | 1.7510 | ( 235) |
| Tot | 4.5683 | 1.6516 | ( 1274) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 45.7032 | ( 5) |
| Within Groups | 3426.8556 | ( 1268) |
| Total | 3472.5589 | ( 1273) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 9a

Analysis of Variance:
Institutional Power Index Broken Down by School
in Site A

| | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| School 1 | 7.9524 | 3.9534 | ( 126) |
| School 2 | 9.2785 | 3.7720 | ( 158) |
| School 3 | 8.8267 | 4.5034 | ( 75) |
| School 4 | 8.3231 | 3.6359 | ( 195) |
| School 5 | 9.1908 | 3.5835 | ( 173) |
| Total | 8.7249 | 3.8310 | ( 727) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 193.4202 | ( 4) |
| Within Groups | 10,461.5591 | ( 722) |

F = 3.3372 SIG. = .0101

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 10a

Analysis of Variance:
Grassroots Power Index Broken Down By School
in Site A

| | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| School 1 | 7.3571 | 4.2284 | ( 126) |
| School 2 | 7.1519 | 3.4293 | ( 158) |
| School 3 | 5.9467 | 3.5102 | ( 75) |
| School 4 | 6.4154 | 3.1125 | ( 195) |
| School 5 | 6.8555 | 3.3196 | ( 173) |
| Total | 6.7950 | 3.5033 | ( 727) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 142.6514 | ( 4) |
| Within Groups | 8,767.8108 | ( 722) |

F = 2.9367 SIG. = .0200

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 10b
Analysis of Variance
Grassroots Power Index by School

| School | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 7.9234 | 3.2229 | 235 |
| 2 | 7.3981 | 3.1732 | 211 |
| 3 | 7.8940 | 3.4390 | 217 |
| 4 | 7.6488 | 3.3260 | 205 |
| 5 | 8.0636 | 3.2556 | 220 |
| 6 | 8.2869 | 3.4888 | 237 |
| Total | 7.8808 | | 1325 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 197.1058 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 14,550.0535 | 1319 |
| Total | 14,657.1593 | 1324 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

F = 1.9419 SIG. = .0849

Table 11a

Analysis of Variance:
Positive School Climate Index Broken Down By School
in Site A

| | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| School 1 | 39.9333 | 9.8899 | ( 120) |
| School 2 | 38.2115 | 10.3985 | ( 156) |
| School 3 | 37.0923 | 8.8242 | ( 65) |
| School 4 | 39.5508 | 8.3467 | ( 187) |
| School 5 | 36.6095 | 9.8253 | ( 169) |
| Total | 38.3745 | 9.5703 | ( 697) |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1,187.8411 | ( 4) |
| Within Groups | 62,559.4243 | ( 692) |

F = 3.2848 SIG. = .0111

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 11b

Analysis of Variance
Positive School Climate Index by School

| School | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 33.9515 | 8.5270 | 227 |
| 2 | 33.5961 | 9.3048 | 203 |
| 3 | 37.1553 | 10.3916 | 206 |
| 4 | 36.5350 | 9.2654 | 200 |
| 5 | 37.5092 | 8.3054 | 218 |
| 6 | 36.7600 | 10.5988 | 225 |
| Total | 35.9156 | 9.5415 | 1279 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3075.2308 | 5 |
| Within Groups | .113E+06 | 1273 |
| Total | .116E+06 | 1278 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 12a

Scores on INTERRACIAL ENVIRONMENT INDEX by Race and Sex: Analysis of Variance in Site A

| | Mean | SD | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| White male | 17.6570 | 3.1574 | 242 |
| White female | 18.5500 | 2.2122 | 320 |
| Black male | 19.1957 | 3.7690 | 46 |
| Black female | 18.6500 | 2.4339 | 20 |
| Other male | 19.3333 | .5774 | 3 |
| Other female | 17.0000 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 18.2595 | | 632 |

Anova Table

| | Sum of Squares | DF |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 163.2542 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 4,716.1889 | 626 |

F = 4.3339 SIG. = .0007

Table 12b

Scores on Interracial Environment Index by Race and Sex: Analysis of Variance

| | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| White male | 18.1349 | 2.7342 | 519 |
| White female | 19.0439 | 2.2405 | 547 |
| Black male | 18.4690 | 2.7110 | 103 |
| Black female | 19.3627 | 2.0909 | 102 |
| Other male | 18,8571 | 2.7695 | 14 |
| Other female | 19.7667 | 2.3589 | 30 |
| Total | 18.6791 | 2.5255 | 1315 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 314.7787 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 8065.7962 | 1309 |
| Total | 8380.5749 | 1314 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

F = 10.2171 SIG. = .0000

Table 13a

INTERRACIAL SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT INDEX Broken Down by Race/Sex Group and School: Analysis of Variance in Site A

| | Mean | SD | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| White Male | | | |
| School 1 | 18.3714 | 4.7532 | ( 35) |
| School 2 | 17.8871 | 3.1000 | ( 62) |
| School 3 | 16.8333 | 2.7279 | ( 18) |
| School 4 | 17.9200 | 2.4092 | ( 75) |
| School 5 | 16.8983 | 2.7773 | ( 59) |
| Total | 17.6546 | 3.1304 | ( 249) |
| White Female | | | |
| School 1 | 18.2453 | 2.1653 | ( 53) |
| School 2 | 18.3016 | 2.3803 | ( 63) |
| School 3 | 18.0000 | 1.9228 | ( 34) |
| School 4 | 19.5506 | 1.8154 | ( 89) |
| School 5 | 18.0741 | 2.3118 | ( 81) |
| Total | 18.5500 | 2.2122 | ( 320) |
| Black Male | | | |
| School 1 | 19.6667 | 5.9899 | ( 12) |
| School 2 | 20.3846 | 3.2797 | ( 13) |
| School 3 | 17.3333 | 1.5275 | ( 3) |
| School 4 | 18.2222 | 2.2236 | ( 9) |
| School 5 | 18.4444 | 1.8105 | ( 9) |
| Total | 19.1957 | 3.7690 | ( 46) |
| Black Female | | | |
| School 1 | 18.6000 | 1.5166 | ( 5) |
| School 2 | 19.0000 | 2.5071 | ( 8) |
| School 3 | 16.2500 | 2.0616 | ( 4) |
| School 4 | 20.0000 | 1.7321 | ( 3) |
| School 5 | 22.0000 | 0 | ( 1) |
| Total | 18.6667 | 2.3735 | ( 21) |

Anova Table

| | Sum of Squares | DF |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 166.9241 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 4,744.0697 | 634 |
| Total | 4,910.9938 | 639 |

F = 4.4616 SIG. = .0005

Table 13b

Interracial School Environment Index Broken Down by Race/Sex Group and School: Analysis of Variance

| | Sum | Mean | S.D. | Variance | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White Male | | | | | |
| School 1 | 1485.0000 | 19.0385 | 2.6845 | 7.2063 | 78 |
| 2 | 1285.0000 | 18.3571 | 3.1670 | 10.0300 | 70 |
| 3 | 1742.0000 | 18.3368 | 3.7745 | 14.2470 | 95 |
| 4 | 1359.0000 | 18.1200 | 2.6710 | 7.1341 | 75 |
| 5 | 1441.0000 | 18.4744 | 2.7715 | 7.6812 | 78 |
| 6 | 1708.0000 | 18.5652 | 4.1066 | 16.8638 | 92 |
| White Female | | | | | |
| School 1 | 1439.0000 | 19.4459 | 2.6901 | 7.2368 | 74 |
| 2 | 2038.0000 | 19.4095 | 2.7724 | 7.6864 | 105 |
| 3 | 1534.0000 | 18.9383 | 2.4359 | 5.9336 | 81 |
| 4 | 1918.0000 | 19.1800 | 1.9765 | 3.9067 | 100 |
| 5 | 1585.0000 | 19.3293 | 2.2391 | 5.0137 | 82 |
| 6 | 1458.0000 | 19.1842 | 2.3478 | 5.5123 | 76 |
| Black Male | | | | | |
| School 1 | 235.0000 | 19.5833 | 1.3790 | 1.9015 | 12 |
| 2 | 288.0000 | 19.20000 | 4.1438 | 17.1714 | 15 |
| 3 | 330.0000 | 19.4118 | 5.4893 | 30.1324 | 17 |
| 4 | 248.0000 | 20.6667 | 3.4728 | 12.0606 | 12 |
| 5 | 296.0000 | 19.7333 | 4.6823 | 21.9238 | 15 |
| 6 | 436.0000 | 18.9565 | 2.4022 | 5.7708 | 23 |
| Black Female | | | | | |
| School 1 | 321.0000 | 20.0625 | 1.8786 | 3.5292 | 16 |
| 2 | 176.0000 | 19.5556 | 1.5899 | 2.5278 | 9 |
| 3 | 271.0000 | 19.3571 | 2.7346 | 7.4780 | 14 |
| 4 | 186.0000 | 18.6000 | 1.8379 | 3.3778 | 10 |
| 5 | 499.0000 | 20.7917 | 2.2454 | 5.0417 | 24 |
| 6 | 378.0000 | 18.9000 | 2.4039 | 5.7789 | 20 |

Table 14a

Scores on INTERRACIAL FRIENDSHIP INDEX by
Race and Sex: Analyses of Variance

| | Mean | SD | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| White male | 7.0433 | 3.2611 | 254 |
| White female | 6.1420 | 1.7661 | 324 |
| Black male | 6.8478 | 3.5651 | 46 |
| Black female | 5.6316 | .8307 | 19 |
| Other male | 5.0000 | 1.4142 | 2 |
| Other female | 4.0000 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 6.5248 | | 646 |

Anova Table

| | Sum of Squares | DF |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 146.7551 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 4,284.3486 | 640 |

F = 4.3845 SIG. = .0006

Table 14b

Scores on Interracial Friendship Index by
Race and Sex: Analysis of Variance

| | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| White male | 6.5973 | 1.5871 | 519 |
| White female | 6.0676 | 1.3069 | 547 |
| Black male | 6.1650 | 1.7551 | 103 |
| Black female | 5.4804 | 1.2799 | 102 |
| Other male | 5.7857 | 2.2931 | 14 |
| Other female | 5.3667 | 1.1592 | 30 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 167.1737 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 2,824.3122 | 1309 |
| Total | 2,991.4859 | 1314 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 15a

Index of INTERRACIAL FRIENDSHIP INDEX by
Race/Sex Group and School:
Analysis of Variance

| | Mean | SD | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| White Male | | | |
| School 1 | 8.1026 | 6.0122 | ( 39) |
| School 2 | 7.1587 | 1.5781 | ( 63) |
| School 3 | 5.8333 | 1.4653 | ( 18) |
| School 4 | 6.8158 | 3.1271 | ( 76) |
| School 5 | 6.9077 | 2.3765 | ( 65) |
| Total | 7.0460 | 3.2436 | ( 261) |
| White Female | | | |
| School 1 | 5.7818 | 2.0700 | ( 55) |
| School 2 | 6.3582 | 1.5443 | ( 67) |
| School 3 | 6.0294 | 1.1142 | ( 34) |
| School 4 | 6.2472 | 2.1913 | ( 89) |
| School 5 | 6.3210 | 2.1262 | ( 81) |
| Total | 6.1871 | 1.9435 | ( 326) |
| Black Male | | | |
| School 1 | 7.2500 | 4.5151 | ( 12) |
| School 2 | 7.8462 | 4.8450 | ( 13) |
| School 3 | 7.6667 | .5774 | ( 3) |
| School 4 | 5.5556 | 1.1304 | ( 9) |
| School 5 | 5.8889 | 1.3642 | ( 9) |
| Total | 6.8478 | 3.5651 | ( 46) |
| Black Female | | | |
| School 1 | 5.7500 | .5000 | ( 4) |
| School 2 | 6.1250 | 2.5319 | ( 8) |
| School 3 | 5.7500 | .5000 | ( 4) |
| School 4 | 6.3333 | 1.1547 | ( 3) |
| School 5 | 5.0000 | 0 | ( 1) |
| Total | 5.9500 | 1.6376 | ( 20) |

Anova Table

| | Sum of Squares | DF |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 129.6420 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 4,587.9189 | 650 |
| Total | 4,717.5610 | 655 |

F = 3.6734 SIG. = .0028

Table 15b

Index of Interracial Friendship by Race/Sex Group and School: Analysis of Variance

| | Sum | Mean | S.D. | Variance | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White Male | | | | | |
| School 1 | 500.0000 | 6.4103 | 1.8050 | 3.2581 | 78 |
| 2 | 481.0000 | 7.0735 | 2.0539 | 4.2184 | 68 |
| 3 | 675.0000 | 7.1053 | 1.9704 | 3.8824 | 95 |
| 4 | 509.0000 | 6.9726 | 1.9577 | 3.8326 | 73 |
| 5 | 540.0000 | 6.8354 | 2.0155 | 4.0623 | 79 |
| 6 | 678.0000 | 7.0625 | 3.6413 | 13.2592 | 96 |
| White Female | | | | | |
| School 1 | 422.0000 | 5.6267 | 1.3634 | 1.8587 | 75 |
| 2 | 681.0000 | 6.4857 | 2.7179 | 7.3868 | 105 |
| 3 | 517.0000 | 6.3827 | 1.3093 | 1.7142 | 81 |
| 4 | 631.0000 | 6.3737 | 1.6073 | 2.5834 | 99 |
| 5 | 489.0000 | 5.9634 | 1.7317 | 2.9986 | 82 |
| 6 | 526.0000 | 6.5750 | 2.6661 | 7.1082 | 80 |
| Black Male | | | | | |
| School 1 | 75.0000 | 5.7692 | 1.2352 | 1.5256 | 13 |
| 2 | 98.0000 | 6.5333 | 4.4860 | 20.1238 | 15 |
| 3 | 178.0000 | 10.4706 | 8.1939 | 67.1397 | 17 |
| 4 | 80.0000 | 6.1538 | 3.0234 | 9.1410 | 13 |
| 5 | 111.0000 | 6.5294 | 1.2307 | 1.5147 | 17 |
| 6 | 156.0000 | 6.5000 | 3.4891 | 12.1739 | 24 |
| Black Female | | | | | |
| School 1 | 89.0000 | 5.5625 | 2.7072 | 7.3292 | 16 |
| 2 | 84.0000 | 7.6364 | 4.5885 | 21.0545 | 11 |
| 3 | 96.0000 | 6.4000 | 2.8735 | 8.2571 | 15 |
| 4 | 58.0000 | 5.2727 | 2.3703 | 5.6182 | 11 |
| 5 | 127.0000 | 5.2917 | 1.2676 | 1.6069 | 24 |
| 6 | 122.0000 | 5.8095 | 1.7782 | 3.1619 | 21 |

Table 15c

Scores of Interracial Friendship Index by School:
Analysis of Variance

| School | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5.9399 | 2.0481 | 233 |
| 2 | 6.8079 | 2.9664 | 203 |
| 3 | 7.1349 | 3.1954 | 215 |
| 4 | 6.4826 | 1.9367 | 201 |
| 5 | 6.2258 | 1.8732 | 217 |
| 6 | 6.6723 | 3.1363 | 235 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 200.7280 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 8745.6493 | 1298 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

F = 5.9583 SIG. = .0000

Table 16b

Mean Scores on Administrative Desegregation Support Index by School

| School | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5.3120 | 2.0152 | 234 |
| 2 | 5.5308 | 1.9106 | 211 |
| 3 | 5.9259 | 1.8386 | 216 |
| 4 | 6.2146 | 1.6428 | 205 |
| 5 | 6.1727 | 1.5695 | 220 |
| 6 | 6.3291 | 1.7640 | 237 |
| TOT | 5.9123 | 1.8355 | 1323 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 189.9165 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 4263.9126 | 1217 |
| Total | 4453.8292 | 1322 |

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

F = 11.7320 SIG. = .0000

Table 17a

Anova Table

The White Predominance Index by Race/Sex Group

| | Sum | Mean | S.D. | Sum of Sq. | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White Male | 19991.0000 | 41.4751 | 4.8944 | 11522.2012 | 482 |
| White Female | 20854.0000 | 39.6464 | 4.5607 | 10920.2281 | 526 |
| Black Male | 3889.0000 | 40.5104 | 5.2335 | 2601.9896 | 96 |
| Black Female | 3995.0000 | 40.3535 | 4.5385 | 2018.6263 | 99 |

Anova Table

| | Sum of Squares | D.F. | Mean Square |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 851.6802 | 5 | 170.3360 |
| Within Groups | 28229.0877 | 1239 | 22.7838 |
| Total | 29080.7679 | 1244 | |

F = 7.4762 SIG. = .0000

Table 18a

The WHITE PREDOMINANCE INDEX Broken Down By
Race/Sex Group and School

| | Mean | SD | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| White Male | | | |
| School 1 | 42.3438 | 4.7560 | ( 32) |
| School 2 | 42.2833 | 5.7522 | ( 60) |
| School 3 | 44.0556 | 5.5675 | ( 18) |
| School 4 | 43.0000 | 4.8127 | ( 75) |
| School 5 | 45.7308 | 4.4858 | ( 52) |
| Total | 43.4093 | 5.1803 | ( 237) |
| White Female | | | |
| School 1 | 40.6538 | 4.0723 | ( 52) |
| School 2 | 41.5556 | 5.0729 | ( 63) |
| School 3 | 40.4706 | 4.6855 | ( 34) |
| School 4 | 41.8353 | 3.6931 | ( 85) |
| School 5 | 43.6790 | 4.3727 | ( 81) |
| Total | 41.9111 | 4.4634 | ( 315) |
| Black Male | | | |
| School 1 | 42.6667 | 4.0311 | ( 9) |
| School 2 | 40.4545 | 4.7405 | ( 11) |
| School 3 | 42.6667 | 3.0551 | ( 3) |
| School 4 | 40.1111 | 9.6882 | ( 9) |
| School 5 | 44.7778 | 3.5629 | ( 9) |
| Total | 41.9756 | 5.8288 | ( 41) |
| Black Female | | | |
| School 1 | 41.0000 | 4.0825 | ( 4) |
| School 2 | 40.8571 | 4.7759 | ( 7) |
| School 3 | 42.7500 | 2.9861 | ( 4) |
| School 4 | 42.3333 | 5.1316 | ( 3) |
| School 5 | 47.0000 | 0 | ( 1) |
| Total | 41.8421 | 4.1266 | ( 19) |

Anova Table

| | Sum of Squares | DF |
|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 449.0207 | 5 |
| Within Groups | 14,264.9793 | 610 |
| Total | 14,714.0000 | 615 |

F = 3.8402 SIG. = .0020

Table 18b

The White Predominance Index by Race/Sex Group and School

| | Sum | Mean | S.D. | Variance | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White Male | | | | | |
| School 1 | 3551.0000 | 40.8161 | 4.6042 | 21.1983 | 87 |
| 2 | 2685.0000 | 41.9531 | 4.8679 | 23.6962 | 64 |
| 3 | 3717.0000 | 41.7640 | 5.2441 | 27.5005 | 89 |
| 4 | 2932.0000 | 43.1176 | 4.5434 | 20.6427 | 68 |
| 5 | 3219.0000 | 40.7468 | 4.4649 | 19.9351 | 79 |
| 6 | 3887.0000 | 40.9158 | 5.1914 | 26.9503 | 95 |
| White Female | | | | | |
| School 1 | 3673.0000 | 39.4946 | 4.3279 | 18.7309 | 93 |
| 2 | 3996.0000 | 38.7961 | 4.3145 | 18.6149 | 103 |
| 3 | 3108.0000 | 40.3636 | 5.3752 | 28.8923 | 77 |
| 4 | 3996.0000 | 40.7755 | 4.4986 | 20.2377 | 98 |
| 5 | 3148.0000 | 39.3500 | 4.6309 | 21.4456 | 80 |
| 6 | 2933.0000 | 39.1067 | 3.9850 | 15.8804 | 75 |
| Black Male | | | | | |
| School 1 | 577.0000 | 41.2143 | 4.4752 | 20.0275 | 14 |
| 2 | 611.0000 | 40.7333 | 5.7628 | 33.2095 | 15 |
| 3 | 630.0000 | 45.0000 | 3.4194 | 11.6923 | 14 |
| 4 | 523.0000 | 40.2308 | 6.6100 | 43.6923 | 13 |
| 5 | 678.0000 | 39.8824 | 3.9510 | 15.6103 | 17 |
| 6 | 870.0000 | 37.8261 | 4.7064 | 22.1502 | 23 |
| Black Female | | | | | |
| School 1 | 774.0000 | 40.7368 | 4.4452 | 19.7602 | 19 |
| 2 | 401.0000 | 40.10000 | 3.3149 | 10.9889 | 10 |
| 3 | 585.0000 | 39.0000 | 4.4078 | 19.4286 | 15 |
| 4 | 471.0000 | 42.8182 | 3.6556 | 13.3636 | 11 |
| 5 | 879.0000 | 38.2174 | 4.7190 | 22.2688 | 23 |
| 6 | 885.0000 | 42.1429 | 4.4641 | 19.9286 | 21 |

References

Arnove, Robert F. with Stout, Toby. Alternative Schools for Disruptive Youth. ERIC 162 413, 1977.

Bennett, Christine. Part II of "A Study of the Causes of Disproportionality in Suspensions and Expulsions of Male and Black Students: Characteristics of High and Low Disproportionality Schools." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Los Angeles, April 1981.

Bennett, Christine. "Political Education for Minority Groups." Chapter 9. New Views of Children and Politics. Richard G. Nieme (ed.) San Francisco: Jersey-Bass, 1974.

Bennett, Christine. "Student Initiated Interaction as an Indicator of Interracial Acceptance in Desegregated Schools." The Journal of Classroom Interaction, Summer, 1980.

Bennett, Christine and Harris, J. John, III. The Project for the Equitable Administration of Student Discipline." USOE Grant #79-5210, Final Report, 1981.

Bickel, Frank and Qualls, Robert. "The Impact of School Climate on Suspension Rates in the Jefferson County Public Schools." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Boston, April, 1981.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare. 1978 Elementary and Secondary Schools Civil Rights Survey. Office For Civil Rights, Reports on Ranked Districts For the Nation, Volume I, July, 1978.

Ehman, Lee. "Political Socialization and the High School Social Studies Curriculum." Unpublished dissertation. The University of Michigan, 1970.

Forehand, Garlie A.; Ragosta, Marjorie, and Rack, Donald A. Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, July, 1976.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure.

Heid, Camilla. Part III of "A Study of the Causes of Disproportionality in Suspensions and Expulsions of Male and Black Students: Teacher and Administrator Attitudes." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Los Angeles, April, 1981.

Moody, Charles D., and others. Student Rights and Discipline: Policies, Programs and Procedures. ERIC ED 160 926, 1978.

Weinberg, Meyer. "Research Review of Equal Education," No. 1, ED 148 974, 1977.